



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

work—would now change much in the light which later criticism has thrown upon many of the inscriptions.

The texts are excellently reproduced. Abel has done his work well. The script of the monumental inscriptions (especially the Black Obelisk) is exceedingly clear and bold; whilst the script of the other inscriptions, though evidently modelled after that of the contract tablets, comes very fairly near the actual script of the inscriptions.

Delitzsch's *Lesestücke* is, however, not made superfluous by this new publication. It can well exist side by side with it. It has a worth above and beyond that of a mere text-book. The syllabaries and vocabularies will still have to be studied there, as well as the story of the Flood.

The note on p. 46 is entirely gratuitous. A comparison of the two texts shows not more than *four* variants!

RICHARD GOTTHEIL,
Columbia College, in the City of New York.

DRIVER'S SAMUEL.*

In his preface, the author discusses the reliability of the MT., which "has suffered unusually from transcriptional corruption," and the history of the textual criticism of the Books of Samuel. Otto Thenius in his *Die Bücher Samuelis* (1842) was the first to point out the value of the LXX. for the study of the MT., and Ewald in 1843 follows closely on the same lines and makes too frequent use of the results of Thenius, without suitable acknowledgment. Driver regards Wellhausen's monogram on the text of the Books of Samuel (1871) as epoch-making. After discussing Wellhausen's methods, he says: "Wellhausen's scholarship is fine: his judgment is rarely at fault; and in the critical treatment of the text, I have been strongly sensible of the value of his guidance. I trust that I may not appear to have used his volume too freely: my excuse, if I have done so, must be that I was writing for English students, most of whom are unacquainted with German; and I could not withhold from them some of the best and soundest results which have been gained for the textual criticism of the Old Testament." The author claims that, notwithstanding his very great indebtedness to Wellhausen, he has always maintained an independent judgment, and a study of the book fully confirms this statement. Driver also acknowledges the value of Klosterman's commentary in Strack and Zöckler's *Kurzgefasster Commentar zu den Heiligen Schriften Alten und Neuen Testaments* (1887), but he regards him as too original, too ingenious, "too apt to assume that the text has suffered more than is probable," and, although scholarly, his restorations are often far-fetched and "betray sometimes a defective appreciation of Hebrew modes of expression."

In his Introduction, Driver discusses

I. The Early History of the Hebrew Alphabet—the **כתב עברי** and **כתב**

* NOTES ON THE HEBREW TEXT OF THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL, with an Introduction on Hebrew Palaeography and the Ancient Versions and Facsimiles of Inscriptions, by the Rev. S. R. Driver, D. D., Regius Professor of Hebrew and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1890.

אשורי, or the so-called Hebrew and Assyrian characters, the latter in later times known as the כרב מרבע, or square, character; the transition of the former to the latter. He also gives facsimiles of many gems and inscriptions written in the עברי, e. g., the inscription of Mesha (as an appendix) and numerous Aramaic, Hebrew, and Phœnician gems. To these are added a transliteration in the square characters, a translation and commentary. The history of the discovery of the Siloam inscription is also given, with transliteration, translation and notes.

II. Early Hebrew Orthography—the division of words. The author thinks that the division of words had been pretty definitely made, and the five final letters introduced before the MT. was established. The LXX., however, often translated from a text with divisions differing widely from those of the MT. He then notices that the *plena scriptio* was rare and that the suffix of the 3 sg. masc. was written ה- instead of ו-, etc., etc.

III. The Chief Ancient Versions of the O. T.—the MSS., the LXX. (which he regards of very great value for the study of all the books of the O. T., but especially valuable for Samuel, parts of Kings and Ezekiel), Targums, Peshitta, etc. The history of these versions and a conservative estimate of their value are given under this heading, but nothing new is added. It is, however, a valuable collection of facts for the student.

IV. Characteristics of the Chief Ancient Versions of Samuel. Here Driver takes up the characteristics of the versions in great detail. His tables are very valuable for the history of textual criticism and as furnishing a basis for the canons which should guide us in our criticism.

I will now examine a very few of his emendations to the MT. of Samuel, taking the examples from the first Book. In III. 7, we have טַרַם יָדַע, i. e., טַרַם with a Perf., which is very rare. Driver suggests יָדַע the Impf. and his emendation is rendered almost certain by the יָדַע in the parallel. His grammatical note on IV. 15 is very instructive. He adds nothing new to the difficult passage in V. 4, where he would either accept Wellhausen's view that the original was דָּגַן and the ך has arisen by dittography from the נִשְׂאָר, or simply say that a word had been dropped out of the text. In IX. 24, the difficult הָעֵלִיָּהּ is taken up at length. ה, with a preposition, with the apparent force of a relative occurs only here. This makes the reading of the MT. very doubtful, and Driver is inclined to read with Geiger, הָאֵלִיָּהּ = *the fat tail*. In XII. 7 he would follow the LXX.'s καὶ ἀπαγγελῶ ὑμῖν and insert וְאֵנִידָהּ לָכֶם. Cf. his remarks on XII. 21 on the intrusive כִּי. XIII. 1 he would take as a marginal gloss. The last three or four verses of ch. XIII. are very difficult and Driver is not able to give us any help. He regards the הַפְצִירָה פִּים as hopelessly corrupt. In XIV. 16 the וַיִּלֶּךְ וְהָלַם is to be corrected with the LXX. to הָלַם וְהָלַם = ἔσθεν καὶ ἐσθεν. Why not retain the וַיִּלֶּךְ here and simply insert the first הָלַם which could have been omitted because of second הָלַם? In XIV. 18 we must also read with the LXX. הַנְּיִשָּׁה הָאֶפֹּר, cf. V. 3 and XXIII. 9. Cf. also his notes on XIV. 21. These examples are sufficient to show his methods, and his position towards the MT. We would have been pleased if he had discussed the literary problems, but these lay without the compass of his book.

In conclusion I would say that Driver has given us a good model for further

work in this line. Every book in the O. T. should be edited as a text-book with textual, grammatical, lexicographical and historical notes. It would also be well to add a glossary of the Hebrew words, so that the Hebrew of any one book could be compared with that of any other. Such critical editions of Hebrew texts would be of great aid not only to the student, but to the higher and lower critics. Driver's lexicographical and grammatical notes are numerous and valuable. He is very conservative. He has made good use of Wellhausen's work on these texts. In the main, he accepts Wellhausen's conclusions. Wellhausen's judgment is seldom at fault, as Driver admits. The texts of Samuel are very corrupt. Every page is full of errors. Driver has attempted to point these out and to correct them. His work has been very successful. The books of Kings should receive similar treatment at once, and all the history furnished by the Assyrian inscriptions should be incorporated in the notes.

ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER,
Yale University.

SCHEIL'S ŠAMŠI-RAMMÂN IV.*

In the preface, the author notes the main points of history connected with the inscription, the difficulty of the text, the poor transcription of the Archaic into the late Assyrian script found in I R. and also the fact that this text contains several unusual and difficult Assyrian words.

Then follow a transliteration and translation of the four columns of this inscription. The method of transliteration is essentially that of the Leipzig school, which is much preferable to the usual French or English (Sayce) system.† With the exception of the preface, the book is autographed and one must add that the author's script is poor and careless. The 67 pp. could have been condensed to 24 if put in type, but for this the publisher could not have charged 8 frs. Hence the number of pages.

There are numerous evidences of great carelessness on the part of the author in his transliteration. I can notice only a few examples: In 1:41 he reads ušpalkit and in 2:23 and 3:37 aṭṭapalkad and in 4:4 appalkid. In the glossary the stem is given as palkâtu. In col. 1, he uniformly writes apal, and later just as uniformly abal, neither of which is correct. In 3:40 we read natbaki and in 4:3 nadbak. There is no consistency in the placing of accents, and in many places the diacritical points of the ḥ and š are omitted—and these mistakes cannot, as is usual, be excused as typographical errors. Both transliteration and translation are to be preferred to those of Ludwig Abel in Schrader's *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*. I will notice only a few readings: In 1:3

* INSCRIPTION ASSYRIENNE ARCHAÏQUE DE ŠAMŠI-RAMMÂN IV. Roi d'assyrie (824-811 AV. J.-C.) transrite, traduite et commentée par le P. V. Scheil, lecteur en théologie de l'ordre de Saint-Dominique. Paris: H. Welter, 1889, pp. vii and 87.—Tables des matières: Texte et Traduction, 2-30; Commentaire philologique, 31-47; Notes de Géographie, 48-55; Notes d'Histoire, 56, 57; Glossaire, 58-67.

† Comme système de transcription, nous avons préféré le plus scientifique, malgré sa témérité, le système à transcription liée et accentuée.